Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The question of apportioning the collections will be considered each year.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.—Motor cars have been exempted from the levy of municipal tolls and this has resulted in loss of revenue to all the municipalities. In this view, will not the municipalities be entitled to a share of the road cess collections ?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The municipalities are compensated for the loss of the vehicle tax collected on motor cars.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.—Even that is not a permanent measure. Is it not desirable therefore to show to the municipalities a source of regular income at least for a period of 3 to 5 years at a time ?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The income derived by the municipalities for 3 years prior to 1935 was taken into consideration before the orders now in force were passed, under which the municipalities continue to get the average income which they were formerly getting.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.—But when the present orders were passed, only the vehicle tax was taken into consideration and not the income from tolls.

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—This was done according to rules.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH.—Roads falling within the boundaries of District Boards are not at all maintained by the Public Works Department and even where they are so maintained, the maintenance is not done satisfactorily.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Arrangements will be made whereby the Public Works Department will attend to the maintenance of all provincial roads within the jurisdiction of both municipalities and district boards and arrangements will also be made for the tarring of all such roads with a view to preventing dust nuisance.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Will the municipalities and district boards be called upon to contribute a portion of the cost of such maintenance and tarring ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—No.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY.—Formerly, some municipalities were deriving the benefit of the vehicle tax and, counting upon that income, they entered into certain commitments. Consequent upon the passing of the Road Traffic Act, the municipalities have been suddenly deprived of that income and they are now unable to make both ends meet.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau).—May I know what the commitments are which the municipalities have entered into counting upon tolls on motor vehicles ?

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY.—For instance, the Malur Town Municipality undertook the lighting and water supply schemes depending upon the income from vehicle tax.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—The income from tolls ought not to be diverted for such general purposes but should be used only for roads.

Mr. GURUSWAMI GOWDA.—As many as 36 buses are using the road within the jurisdiction of Hoskote Municipality and yet, for repairing the road, the municipality has been called upon to pay a contribution.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—As I have already stated, Municipalities and District Boards will not be expected to bear any portion of the cost of maintenance of provincial roads passing through their limits.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.

I. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Mysore State Life Insurance Act, 1917.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. A. N. Raghavachar) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

The present title of the Insurance Department, *viz.*, " Mysore State Life Insurance Committee, " does not make it clear that it is a Government concern. It has been found desirable to change the name to " The Mysore Government Life Insurance Department. " The change necessitates verbal amendments to the Mysore State Life Insurance Act, 1917. It is accordingly proposed to amend the Act.

The general principles of the bill were accepted.

II. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Provident Funds Act, 1916.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. A. N. Raghavachar) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

Under clause 6 of the Provident Funds Act, 1916, as it now stands, the Act cannot be extended to the Provident Funds established by the Palace in its various branches for the benefit of its employees. The Palace Provident Funds are constituted and administered on exactly the same lines as the State Provident Fund and with the same object. In these Funds, even temporary withdrawals which are permitted in the State Provident Fund are not allowed.

With a view, therefore, to extend the Act to the Palace Provident Funds, it is proposed to amend this Act.

The general principles of the bill were accepted by the House.

III. General Principles of the Bill further to amend the Mysore Village Panchayet Act.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. P. H. Krishna Rao) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

At present, there is no provision in the Mysore Village Panchayet Act enabling either the Government or the Village Panchayets to frame rules for the regulation of water-supply in villages similar to Section 51 (*m*) of the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933. The existing provisions of the Mysore Village Panchayet Act are not wide enough and do not enable the Village Panchayets or the Government to frame rules for having complete control over the water works or for regulating the supply of water from them.

As several villages have now got protected water-supply installations, it is considered necessary that the Government should have power to frame rules for regulating the water-supply suitable to the needs of a particular village panchayet. It is therefore proposed to amend Section 32 of the Village Panchayet Act for this purpose.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA feared that the Government, if once they took power to do so, might frame rules subjecting village panchayets to various taxes. He therefore wanted to know the exact nature of the rules which the Government had in contemplation.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO replied that such details had not yet been decided and that the only object of the bill in question was to enable village panchayets to frame such rules as they liked.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA thereupon asked whether the village panchayets would not be compelled to levy meter charges, excess water charges, etc., as in the cities.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO replied that there was no such intention.

Mr. Rayara KEMPANNA enquired whether the proposed legislation would apply only to supply of pipe water or to water from wells also.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO replied that it was intended to apply to protected water-supply, *i.e.*, pipe water.

The general principles of the bill were thereupon accepted by the House.

IV. General Principles of the Bill further to amend the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. P. H. Krishna Rao) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

Section 178 (2) of the Mysore City Municipalities Act, 1933, contemplates the production of a certificate by a "Medical Officer" in regard to the overcrowding of the interior of a building before action can be taken by a Magistrate in this behalf. The Health Officers in the Bangalore and the Mysore City Municipalities cannot furnish a certificate under this section as they are not designated as *Medical Officers* though they possess medical qualifications. It is, therefore, proposed to amend this sub-section by adding the words "or health" between "medical"

and "officer" so that there may not be any legal difficulty for them to furnish certificates under this section.

Messrs. MIRZA AZEEZULLA BEIG, A. N. RAMA RAO and B. L. BYANNA opposed the bill for the reason that the health officers, being subordinates of the municipal councils concerned, would support the view taken by the councils and put house-owners to needless trouble. Particularly in the cities of Bangalore and Mysore where any number of competent medical officers were available, it was not necessary to give extra powers to the health officers attached to the municipalities. And even granting that certificates were necessary as to whether there was overcrowding or not, it was quite easy for the municipalities to obtain independent medical opinion from doctors other than employees of the municipalities.

Mr. M. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO agreed with the opinions expressed by the previous speakers and added that the question as to whether there was overcrowding or not was after all a very simple matter and no expert was needed to pronounce an opinion. The proposed legislation would only lead to a number of uncalled for prosecutions, without at the same time throwing open suitable remedy to house-owners. In this way the proposed legislation would in effect put a premium on the tendency to launch unnecessary prosecutions.

Messrs. M. SUBBAIYA and Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER, however, thought that there was no warrant to suspect the *bona fides* of health officers and that there was no harm in passing the proposed bill.

Mr. P. H. KRISHNA RAO replied that the health officer's opinion would not be accepted as decisive. In fact, whether the opinion was furnished by a medical officer or a health officer, it would necessarily go before a competent Magistrate who might or might not accept the opinion referred to. It was possible that the Magistrate himself might inspect the spot and decide the case according to his findings. As regards hardship to house-owners, he added that these would be given every reasonable opportunity for questioning the medical opinion.

The general principles of the bill were then accepted.

V. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Mysore University Act, 1916.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

The University established and incorporated under the University Act V of 1916 is, by its constitution, a teaching University of the unitary type with its component institutions distributed between Bangalore and Mysore. Section 17 of the revised University Act III of 1933 requires that colleges, schools and other institutions for study and research shall be maintained by the University.

The federal principle in regard to University administration has since been gaining ground and it is agreed that efficiency and high standards can be maintained even if the colleges within the purview of a University are not all directly administered by it. It is, therefore, desirable that the University of Mysore should have powers to bring within its ambit institutions in areas territorially and culturally related to Mysore. It is therefore proposed to give the University power to affiliate institutions by suitably amending the Act. The details of affiliation like territorial and other limitations, privileges of affiliation, etc., will be regulated by the Statutes in due course. The University authorities, namely, the Academic Council, the Council and the Senate have recommended that the University should have power to affiliate.

The amendments proposed relate to the definition of affiliated colleges and the privileges of affiliation. The Principal of an affiliated college will be *ex officio* member of the Senate and the Academic Council and the members of the staff of an affiliated college will be *ex officio* members of the Academic Council like the corresponding members of the staff of the University colleges.

The general principles of the bill were accepted.

VI. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners Act, 1884.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

The question of amending the Mysore Legal Practitioners Act, 1884, so as to permit of the effective suppression of touting has been under the consideration of Government for some time. The law as it stands at present has proved not very effective to control this evil. The Laws Delays Committee recommended the introduction of clear and definite rules on the lines of those obtaining in British India. In consultation with the High Court, it is proposed to amend the Legal Practitioners Act on the lines of the Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Act, 1926, of British India.

The main changes proposed are :—

(1) to extend the definition of a tout in Section 3 of the Legal Practitioners Act so as to include firstly, persons whose remuneration comes from any person interested in any legal business as well as persons whose remuneration comes from the legal practitioner himself, and secondly, persons who habitually frequent places of public resort for the purpose of procuring employment in any legal business of any legal practitioner ;

(2) to permit the receipt of a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of a Bar Association as evidence of general repute ;

(3) to enable the courts and authorities who may now frame and publish lists of touts to cause enquiries to be held by a subordinate court, which inquiries, if that subordinate court concludes that the persons in question have been proved as touts, will lead to their inclusion in the list of touts framed and published under Section 26 of the Legal Practitioners Act ; and

(4) to penalise any person whose name has been included in the list of touts who continues to act as tout.

In regard to the last point, it will be observed that, under Section 26 of the Legal Practitioners Act, the authorities are only empowered to exclude from the precincts of the court persons named in the list of touts. With the extension of the definition of a tout to persons who frequent places of public resort other than civil or criminal courts, such a penal provision is required.

Messrs. MIR MAHOMED HUSSAIN, JATHARE NAIK, ABDUL RASOOL SAB, Isturi SAMPANGIRAMIAH SETTY and Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER spoke in support of the general principles.

Mr. BALE GOWDA said that, generally speaking, there need be no objection to the proposed legislation. But as regards the second of the main changes indicated in the statement of general principles, it might not be easy to secure a two thirds majority in the case of resolutions to be passed by Bar Associations regarding the general reputation of particular persons. He therefore suggested that resolutions passed by even a bare majority should be accepted as evidence of the general repute of such persons.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA agreed in this view.

The PRESIDENT considered that this was a matter of detail and might well be left to the Legislative Council to deal with.

Mr. Rayara KEMPANNA referred to the first of the changes mentioned in the statement and said that it was reasonable to prevent touts from resorting to courts of law. But he did not think that it would be reasonable to prevent them from entering places of public resort.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau) replied that there was certainly no idea of preventing anybody from resorting to public places. The only object underlying the bill was to prevent the touts from going to such places with a view to procuring the business in question.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG enquired whether it was intended to prevent

persons from even interfering in a dispute or brawl with a view to effecting a compromise or restoring good understanding.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU said that that was not the intention. He added that the chief difficulty about this bill appeared to be that the term "tout" could not adequately be defined or its meaning made sufficiently clear in the Kannada language.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG however remarked that the House could not accept the general principles of the bill as they appeared at present. He felt that some alterations which he could not readily explain were really called for.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU stated that the definition of the term "tout" as proposed to be adopted in Mysore was exactly the same as that in the British Indian Act so that the House need have no apprehensions in the matter.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY suggested that in the case of persons interfering in a quarrel or brawl with the sole object of restoring harmony or pacifying the contending parties, exemptions might be provided for in the proposed law.

Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMY observed that interference for such purposes was a matter of daily occurrence in the villages and that some assurance from Government was really needed to the effect that respectable persons trying to settle disputes with no ulterior motives would continue to be safe even under the proposed law.

The general principles of the bill were then accepted.

The House adjourned for lunch at 3 p.m., and reassembled at 3-30 p.m.

VII. Statement of the General Principles of the Bill to amend the Code of Civil Procedure.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Act, 1938, amending Section 60 of the Code of Civil Procedure, was passed to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on labour and of the Committee appointed to examine the question of indebtedness in Mysore. Under this amendment,—

(1) wages of labourers and domestic servants and salary to the extent of the first fifty rupees and one-half of the remainder of such salary, and

(2) salary of any public officer or any servant of a railway company or local authority to the extent of the first fifty rupees and one half of the remainder of such salary,

are exempt from attachment.

It has since been found however that there are difficulties in the interpretation and working of Section 60 of the Code, particularly in regard to the following matters :—

(1) the scope of the term "labourer," *i.e.*, whether it applies only to unskilled workers or whether it includes skilled workers also ;

(2) whether wages and salary if accumulated could be attached as debt, and

(3) whether insurance premia, subscription to provident funds, etc., could be deducted from the gross salary before determining the amount of salary available for attachment.

The scope of the term "labourers" appears to have been somewhat limited by the decision of the Courts. The wages of labourers and domestic servants were exempt from attachment under the old Code of Civil Procedure also. It has been held by Courts in some cases that "labourers" are persons who earn their living by personal manual labour in occupations which require little or no art, skill or previous education. It would thus appear that only unskilled workers would get the benefit of the exemption in this section while skilled workers would not get the benefit.

It is obvious that such a distinction will remove from the scope of the exemption a large category of workmen like maistries, fitters, engine drivers, machine workmen, blacksmiths, blasters, drillers and such others who would have to be considered as skilled workmen.

Most of the so-called skilled workmen do not get high wages and they are not far better than unskilled workmen in respect of their earnings. It would be a hardship if they should get no exemption at all.

As the section stands at present, the wages of most skilled workmen do not appear to come under any sort of exemption, not even the fifty rupees limit, since their remuneration which is fixed on the daily rate basis is not considered as salary. This is the only class of workmen that do not get any exemption.

It is necessary in the interests of organised industries that even a skilled labourer in debt should be allowed some means of subsistence by giving him the benefit of exemption from attachment of wages or salary up to the fifty rupees limit at least.

Under Section 60, Explanation 1, as amended by Act XIII of 1938, wages of labourers and domestic servants, and salaries of officials, etc., are exempt from attachment whether before or after they are actually payable. But the salary of private officials and workmen is not exempt from attachment if it has become actually payable. There is no necessity for the distinction and this exemption from attachment after the salary has become actually payable should be allowed to private employees also.

There is no definite indication in Section 60, whether compulsory deductions on account of insurance premia, subscriptions to provident funds, etc., have to be deducted from the total monthly emoluments for determining the salary liable to attachment. It is possible to interpret that salary means the salary actually drawn, *i.e.*, the net salary after deducting deductions at source. It is desirable to make this point clear.

It is therefore proposed to amend the Code of Civil Procedure with a view to a clearer elucidation of the points mentioned above.

Mr. Vajapeyam VENKATESAIYA observed that like anybody else the labourer also deserved to be assured of a minimum income in spite of Court attachment in order to be able to keep his body and soul together, and to provide bread for his dependants. From this point of view, he said, that the amendments proposed were very desirable and he therefore supported the proposed legislation.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO generally supported the general principles of the bill, but he thought that with regard to amending Section 60 of the Code of Civil Procedure specific exemption should be provided for in the case of co-operative societies. Many middle class men and petty officials of Government were indebted to co-operative institutions, and unless exemption was given in the case of co-operative institutions, they would be deprived of the existing scope for recovering their dues. Otherwise, the societies would refuse to grant loans to such persons with the result that the latter would in future be disabled from obtaining loans anywhere.

Messrs. S. RAMAPPA and **M. SUBBIAH** also agreed in this view. **Mr. SUBBIAH** added that at the present time a number of joint stock concerns were failing, and that the same fate would overtake the co-operative institutions also unless some special concession was extended in their case.

Mr. M. SUBBIAH then raised the question whether the limit of Rs. 50, proposed to be exempted from attachment, referred to the gross pay drawn by an employee or the net amount drawn after meeting insurance premia or provident fund subscription, etc. Personally he felt that it was the gross pay that should be taken into consideration for such purposes. Otherwise it was possible that a particular debtor went on insuring further as increments were earned with a view to safeguarding the interests of his family to the detriment of the interests of the creditor. He would even go so far as to suggest that the limit of exemption might if necessary, be raised from Rs. 50 to Rs. 60, rather than agree that the amount to be exempted from attachment should relate to the net pay drawn.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMY IYER did not think that any exemption was called for at all in the case of co-operative societies.

This was also the opinion of **Mr. S. C. MALLIAH** who said that considerations

of loyalty to the institutions required that every member of a society should promptly repay the loan instalments as they fell due. Besides, any special concession shown in the case of members of co-operative institutions, would savour of invidious distinction which was certainly not the intention of the legislation under discussion.

Mr. R. G. K. MORRISON.—There seems to be some misapprehension about the objects of this amendment. As one who represents the mining industry, which is employing a large volume of labour, whose interests are close to our hearts, I should like to point out a few facts, as to where hardship will be created under the existing conditions. The word labour—skilled and unskilled—is still open to numerous interpretations, and at the present time there exist in the mines something to the order of 400 different classifications which in days gone by had been classified on the basis of skilled and unskilled labour. You have the case of a youth of 15 or 16 starting as a fitter. He gets a nominal pay which gradually rises with his service until he passes on to the classification of a third class workman. His pay is eight annas and his job is very tight. Yet he is classed as a skilled labourer. It is obvious that this amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure, which proceeds on the basis of salary rather than on the arbitrary classification of skilled and unskilled labour, is more rational. I submit that in such cases, which exist in all large industrial organisations, classifications of labour on the salary basis is more sound than classification as skilled and unskilled. So, I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. J. ASWATHANARAYANA RAO supported the general principles of the bill in question in so far as (i) affording to skilled labour the same concessions as were being enjoyed by unskilled labour and (ii) extending to private employees the concession which was being enjoyed by Government officials in the matter of exemption from salary attachment, were concerned. He was not sure of all that was meant by the word "etc.," in the penultimate paragraph of the statement of general principles. He agreed with the previous speaker that any limit of exemption from attachment should refer to the gross pay and not to the net pay so that while the interests of a debtor's family were secured, the creditor would not be duped. He also suggested that it be made clear whether maistries, for example, who were not regular employees of anybody, but petty contractors, should be exempted from attachment and if so, to what extent. With regard to the question of allowing a special concession to co-operative institutions, he also thought that there was no necessity to treat such institutions as in any way different from other creditors.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUFF SAHIB supported the bill in view of the question of equal treatment to skilled and unskilled labourers. With regard, however, to co-operative societies, he was strongly of opinion that no society could render succour to its needy members unless special exemptions were allowed in its case. He was surprised that the previous speaker should have placed co-operative societies on a par with private creditors, when there was an outstanding difference between the two in that in the case of a society both creditors and debtors happened to be the same set of people.

Mr. G. MALLANNA expressed the opinion that the limit of exemption should refer only to the gross pay and not to the net pay.

Mr. M. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO thought that no special exemption was called for in the case of co-operative institutions.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina N. Madhava Rau), in reply to the debate, stated that the discussions related to three main points. The first of them referred to the question of equal treatment to skilled and unskilled labourers. On that question most of the members in the House seemed to be agreed that the same protection was called for in both the cases, whether the individuals concerned happened to be Government officials or private employees. The second point was about monthly pay as opposed to daily wages.

He did not believe that any elaborate discussion on that point was necessary, because in either case the total amount drawn for a whole month would be taken into consideration before the limit of exemption was determined. The only point on which there appeared to be some difference of opinion was whether that limit should have reference to the gross pay drawn or to the balance remaining after payment of insurance premia, provident fund subscription, etc. Explanation No. 2 to the definition of the terms "wages" and "salary" in the bill made the intention quite clear. The same meaning had been expressed in the Mysore Service Regulations also—namely, that subscription to Provident Funds recognised by Government, deductions for which appeared in the salary bills, should be definitely excluded for purposes of attachment by Civil Courts.

He did not believe that the question of exemption in favour of co-operative societies was very relevant to the amendment under discussion; because whatever action was taken in consonance with the proposed amendment, would apply equally to co-operative societies as well as other creditors. He did not believe that the apprehension expressed by Mr. A. N. Rama Rao was justified, namely, that co-operative societies would refuse membership or refuse loans to their members unless special exemption was given in their case. After all, societies granted loans to their members only because they were thought creditworthy by the former and not because their salaries could be readily attached. The Code of Civil Procedure was meant to apply to everybody so that it would not be fair to exclude any particular class of creditors from its operation.

Mr. M. SUBBIAH suggested that it would be desirable to make this attitude of Government clear instead of leaving it for interpretation by different Courts of Law.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that the intention would become patent to anybody because any items meant to be exempt from attachment would be declared as such by Government in the shape of a notification to be duly published in the official gazette.

Mr. Isturi SAMPANGIRAMIAH SETTY remarked that when all kinds of protection were being afforded to debtors, the Government were not taking action to safeguard the interests of creditors.

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU replied that it was with the object of reconciling the two interests, that the proposed legislation was contemplated.

Mr. Shampoor PAPANNA generally supported the proposed law, but remarked that it was unfortunate that retrospective effect was being given to all the special legislations which were being enacted in the interests of debtors.

The general principles of the bill were then accepted by the House

VIII. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1928.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa) explained the general principles of the bill as follows:—

There are no laws and rules in any part of India relating to the grant of compensation to workmen found to be suffering from silicosis of lungs—an occupational disease incidental to gold mining and other industries which produce mineral dust. The Workmen's Compensation Act is proposed to be amended by the addition of a clause providing for the grant of compensation to workmen suffering from silicosis in the secondary stage, considering it to be equivalent to permanent total disablement. Separate scales of compensation for the ante-primary and primary stages are also provided for. In view of the special character of the disease and the large number of workers involved, penal provisions are to be incorporated for the strict observance by the workmen of the provisions contained in Rule 9 of the rules to be issued under the title "The Mysore Silicosis Rules."

The general principles of the bill were accepted by the House.

IX. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Mysore Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act III of 1920.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

With a view to bringing the scales of fees leviable for inspection of Boilers in the State under the Mysore Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act III of 1920 into line with the British Indian scales, it has been found necessary to amend Section 24 (*b*) and to delete Schedule B of the existing Act. A draft bill is proposed to be introduced to achieve the above object.

The general principles of the bill were accepted by the House.

X. General Principles of the Bill to provide for Grading and Marking of certain Agricultural Produce in the State.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT(Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa) explained the general principles of the bill as follows :—

In connection with the marketing survey of certain commodities, the Government of India arranged for conducting successfully, experiments for better grading and marking of certain agricultural commodities, *e.g.*, Hides and Eggs. The experiments created a desire in the trade for the sorting and packing of the produce concerned according to prescribed grade specifications and the marking of such grades of produce in a distinctive manner and this was followed by the Government of India enacting Act I of 1937, for the grading and marking of, agricultural produce in British India.

A measure on the lines of the British Indian Act is considered necessary for the State in view of the fact that arrangements have been made for marketing survey of certain agricultural commodities of local importance. It is accordingly proposed to introduce a bill to provide for grading and marking of certain agricultural produce in the State.

The proposed bill provides, as in British India, for experiments being carried on for grading and marking of certain agricultural commodities, and as the practice of using distinctive marks will be in an experimental stage, it is not proposed to make it obligatory on all persons who may be dealing in a commodity but to limit it to those who wish to participate in the experiment. Provision is also made in the bill for safeguarding the marks against improper and unauthorised use and for penalising imitation, or forgery of prescribed marks.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY enquired what were all the commodities proposed to be brought under the operation of the proposed legislation.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA replied that it would apply to vegetables, fruits, coffee, areca-nut, eggs, hides and virginia tobacco.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY feared that if this law was passed, dealers in the commodities referred to would have to undergo a lot of inconvenience.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA replied that the law would not apply to all dealers. Only those that wanted to participate in the benefits of the certificate would have to follow the law ; but he added that as against any small inconvenience that they might have to undergo, they would have the very great advantage of inspiring a large amount of confidence in the general market which they could not do without.

Messrs. B. L. BYANNA, CHANNA. MARE GOWDA and **HUTCHAPPA** were of opinion that things were going on quite smoothly and satisfactorily at present and that the proposed legislation was not really necessary.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA did not agree that by subjecting themselves to the inconveniences of the proposed law, merchants stood to derive any fresh advantages.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA stated that so long as they could deal in articles the superiority of which was made manifest to the public, they were bound to derive larger profits.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA still thought that if the consuming public derived the benefits of better education, they would be in a position to discriminate between good and bad stuff so that even without the aid of any special legislation they could know for themselves which articles they should go in for in preference to others on the market.

Srimathi SAKAMMA explained that coffee planters and other businessmen had repeatedly represented to Government that some such legislation was called for. The legislation, if enacted, was sure to help the raiyats in that they would be enabled to secure much better prices for their commodities by satisfying the intending purchasers that those commodities were certified to be of a superior variety. At present, however, even commodities of a high grade were not fetching satisfactory prices in all cases.

Messrs. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER, JATHARE NAIK, MEER MAHOMED SAB, S. C. BELURIAH, Rayara KEMPANNA, MUNIVENKATAPPA and **ABDUL RASOOL SAB** spoke in favour of the legislation.

Mr. S. VENKATASWAMY GOWDA added that the legislation would prove a blessing not only to the suppliers but also to the consumers. No doubt the consumers in the cities were in a position to discriminate between good and bad stuff, but villagers and townsmen stood in need of something to guide them in ascertaining whether a particular commodity was of a superior variety or not.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA stated that even at present many of the important commodities bore distinctive marks so that any additional marking would only lead to confusion on the part of the purchasers. The certificate proposed to be issued under the law in question might therefore, if at all, confine itself to indicating that the assortment of a given commodity was satisfactory and dependable.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA stated that it would not be correct to say that all commodities exposed for sale would bear distinctive marks. It might be so in some cases. The proposed law might be made applicable to all or some of the commodities not contemplated at present. That was why Government had thought it necessary to reserve power to add to or remove from the list of commodities from time to time.

Messrs. Shampoor PAPANNA and **MIRZA AZIZULLA BAIG** spoke further supporting the general principles of the bill as it was solely meant to enable the suppliers to get full prices for their commodities and also to help the purchasers to know the exact quality of articles which they were going in for.

The general principles of the bill were then accepted by the House.

The House adjourned at 5 p.m., to meet again at 12 of the clock on the following day.

SECOND DAY.

Wednesday, 31st May 1939.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Wednesday, 31st May 1939, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.